C2175-1 3/31/82

CH MNA4WSS52DJD99SAMPLE 6 XE
JOE MCNALLY
CONGRESSIONAL INFO SERV
425 E WEST HWY
WASHINGTON DC 20014

CHRONICLE
of Higher Education •

ISSN 0009-5982

March 31, 1982 • $1.25
Volume XXIV, Number 5

News Summary

Articles on inside pages

Shimer College has been on the brink of insolvency for years, but loyal students and faculty members hope to keep it from going under. Story on Page 5.

The first fossil remains of a land mammal in Antarctica have been found by a team of U.S. scientists. Story on Page 3.

Yale University has turned down a government grant after a professor of mathematics there refused to comply with federal rules on accounting for his time. Story on Page 4.

A women's university in Mississippi has defended its single-sex admissions policy before the Supreme Court. Story on Page 9.

Science education would get $30-million more than President Reagan asked under a measure approved by a House committee. Story on Page 9.

Scholars and journalists who reveal the names of covert intelligence agents would face imprisonment and fines under a bill passed by the Senate. Story on Page 12.

Tenants of One Dupont Circle, owned by the American Council on Education, face rent increases of 30 per cent. Story on Page 8.

The financial crunch has arrived at one of the most successful scholarly publishers in the U.S.—the University of Chicago Press. Story on Page 17.

Israeli authorities want to close Bir Zeit University permanently, officials of the West Bank institution have charged. Story on Page 15.

Despite budget increases, British Columbia's three universities have been forced to cut personnel and programs. Story on Page 15.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Books	17-20
Bulletin Board	26-55
Calendar of Events	24-25
Canadian News	15-16
Deadlines	25
Deaths	22
Fact-File	10
Gazette	22
Grants	22-24
International News	15-16
Letters	21
Marginalia	2
News in Brief	2-3
Notes on Computers	3
Opinion	21
Point of View	56
Washington News	9-14

Colleges Move to Offset Loss of Student Aid; House Panel Refuses to Cut Loans Further

House Panel

WASHINGTON

Turning its back on President Reagan's proposals to make drastic cuts in Guaranteed Student Loans, the House Appropriations Committee last week voted to provide an additional $1.3-billion for the program this year—$322-million more than the President wants.

The committee also put the Education Department on notice that it opposes a plan being considered by the agency that would make it harder for students living with their parents to qualify for Pell Grants.

In a later vote, the House of Representatives approved a stopgap measure that would keep money flowing to the Department of Education and other federal agencies for the rest of the current fiscal year.

In approving the extra money for student loans in fiscal 1982, which began October 1, the appropriations panel rejected the President's proposals to cut loan costs by boosting the interest rates and fees paid by borrowers, and by barring graduate students from the loan program. The money is part of a supplemental appropriations bill for several federal activities.

The additional money is needed for the loans—many of which will be used by students in the 1982-83 academic year—because Congress has so far appropriated only $1.773-billion for them. That is about $1.3-billion short of the $3.073-billion the program is expected to cost this year.

The new loan restrictions proposed by the Administration would keep costs down to $2.75-billion, so the President asked Congress to provide only $978-million in additional funds.

In voting for the full $1.3-billion, the committee said in its report on the bill:

"At this time, it seems unlikely that

Continued on Page 14, Column 1

Double-digit increases in tuition for next fall are common, even though the rate of inflation has slowed. Story on Page 7.

Offsetting U.S. Cutbacks

By JANET HOOK

Bracing for the loss of millions of dollars in federal aid next fall, colleges and universities are looking for ways to help their students make ends meet when the time comes to pay tuition bills.

Some are allocating a greater share of their own resources to cushion the blow of cutbacks in federal grants, loans, and job subsidies in academic 1982-83.

Many are launching aggressive fund-raising drives, raising tuition, and economizing in other areas of campus spending.

"We're putting our entire budget under a microscope, pulling every loose penny out," says Stephen J. Trachtenberg, president of the University of Hartford. "We've made student aid the single highest priority in our budget this year."

The prospect of reduced federal assistance has spurred efforts to establish new loan and work-study programs in states and at individual institutions. Many col-

Continued on Page 14, Column 1

AAUP Challenges Claim that Faculty Layoffs Need Not Be Based Mainly on 'Exigency'

By ROBERT L. JACOBSON

WASHINGTON

Officials of the American Association of University Professors have disputed a lawyer's contention that colleges and universities need not rely mainly on "financial exigency" to lay off tenured faculty members.

Reacting to statements by the lawyer, David J. Figuli, that were reported in *The Chronicle* (March 17), leaders of the faculty group also criticized the American Council on Education for sponsoring his appearance at national "leadership seminars" for academic administrators.

"The guy's wrong," said Matthew W. Finkin, chairman of the association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure. He and other A.A.U.P. leaders especially challenged Mr. Figuli's view that a decision last June by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was a "breakthrough" in judicial thinking on faculty dismissals.

The A.A.U.P. officials seemed concerned that Mr. Figuli's analysis might encourage colleges to take a more aggressive approach to layoffs.

The decision by the Court of Appeals upheld the ouster of two tenured professors of physical education at Humacao University College of the University of Puerto Rico after their program was discontinued. Attracting little attention at first, it has become the focus of a debate over faculty rights at a time of severe pressures to reduce university expenditures.

Mr. Figuli, who is now a labor-relations lawyer in Ohio, is former chief legal counsel for the Montana University System and former general counsel for the South Dakota board of regents.

He cited the Puerto Rico decision to support his belief that most college officials probably have much broader latitude than they realize to override contractual limitations on the dismissal of tenured professors.

Rather than having to demonstrate the existence of a "bona fide" financial emer-

Continued on Page 6, Column 1

Equal Pension Benefits Ordered for Men and Women

By CHERYL M. FIELDS

NEW YORK

A federal district judge here has reaffirmed a decision that the College Retirement Equities Fund must pay equal benefits to men and women.

The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund is the country's major provider of pension plans to colleges and universities.

Judge Robert J. Ward of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York reaffirmed his 1979 ruling in a case filed against the pension company and Long Island University by a faculty member, Diana L. Spirt.

He refused, however, to merge the case with another lawsuit challenging a decision by the New York State insurance commissioner to reject a "unisex" pension plan proposed by T.I.A.A.-C.R.E.F.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit had asked Judge Ward to review his 1979 decision.

C.R.E.F. had appealed Judge Ward's ruling to the circuit court, arguing that it had acted "in good faith" in its belief that it legally could use separate mortality tables in calculating annuity benefits for male and female retirees.

Women have been paid lower monthly benefits than men under its retirement plans because the mortality tables showed that the average woman lived longer than the average man and thus would collect payments over a longer period.

Judge Ward upheld his original ruling that such payments violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bars sex bias in the treatment of employees.

The court held in 1979, he said, and "re-

Continued on Page 8, Column 1

Direct Agencies to Equip Labs, Congress Urged

WASHINGTON

Old and deteriorating research equipment has not been replaced at universities across the country partly because scientists haven't devoted enough of their federal research funds to upgrading it.

That's the conclusion of Donald N. Langenberg, deputy director of the National Science Foundation. He said Congress could help reduce the problem by directing federal agencies to spend $200-million annually to equip university laboratories.

Another $200-million a year could come from industry, he added.

Mr. Langenberg told a panel of the House Science and Technology Committee that as increases in federal research support slowed during the past decade, university researchers had put off investments in research equipment and spent the money to support graduate students and research assistants.

Researchers believed then, he said, that "the best strategy was to maintain people" and put off replacements of aging equipment "until things got better."

Could Cost $4-Billion

Now scientists have begun to realize the extent of the problem and have bought more equipment, Mr. Langenberg said. But he estimated that updating research equipment at universities across the country would cost between $1-billion and $4-billion.

A survey conducted last year by the Association of American Universities concluded that the research equipment at universities was, on the average, twice as old as that used by industry.

A more recent study by the association found that universities had spent a combined total of $400-million for research laboratories and equipment during the past four years. It estimated that twice that much should be spent in the next three years.

The National Science Foundation plans to increase its support of research-equipment purchases by 11.5 per cent over the current fiscal year, to $93.5-million in fiscal 1983, according to Mr. Langenberg.

He said the Defense Department was proposing to spend $30-million for university research equipment in fiscal 1983. Other agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Energy, also were planning to increase such expenditures, he said.

2 Studies Under Way

In response to questions from committee members, Mr. Langenberg acknowledged that the N.S.F. and the N.I.H. had no procedures for assuring that the money they allocate in their research budgets for equipment is actually spent for it by researchers.

He said a federal interagency task force was monitoring the problem of obsolete equipment. Another group at the National Academy of Sciences, chaired by William A. Fowler, a physics professor at the California Institute of Technology, began its study of the issue this month.

Mr. Fowler said his group would examine, among other matters, the question of whether researchers are spending too much on operating costs and salaries, at the expense of research equipment. It will also try to determine how much equipment industry can be expected to donate to universities under new federal tax provisions designed to stimulate such gifts.

He said poor laboratory equipment is prompting researchers to leave universities for industry positions and turning many graduate students away from experimental research.

—KIM McDONALD

FACT-FILE

U.S. Funds for Colleges and Universities

The top 100 institutions in total federal obligations for fiscal 1980

Institution	Research and development (a) Amount	Rank	Total federal obligations (a) Amount	Rank
Johns Hopkins U. (b)	$ 239,869,000	1	$ 260,977,000	1
Howard U. (c)	7,144,000	124	166,146,000	2
Mass. Inst. of Technology	141,011,000	2	163,206,000	3
U. of Washington	100,567,000	4	131,261,000	4
Stanford U.	104,539,000	3	122,223,000	5
U. of Cal., Los Angeles	87,073,000	6	118,908,000	6
U. of Minnesota	74,739,000	11	115,750,000	7
U. of Wisconsin, Madison	80,460,000	9	109,988,000	8
Harvard U.	83,997,000	7	109,038,000	9
U. of Cal., San Diego	90,703,000	5	103,043,000	10
U. of Michigan	71,204,000	12	100,164,000	11
Columbia U., Main Div.	81,361,000	8	99,213,000	12
Cornell U.	74,761,000	10	97,944,000	13
U. of Pennsylvania	70,843,000	13	89,176,000	14
Yale U.	67,970,000	14	87,060,000	15
Pennsylvania St. U. (d)	48,275,000	20	85,774,000	16
U. of Cal., San Francisco	62,581,000	15	80,023,000	17
U. of Cal., Berkeley	49,943,000	19	70,343,000	18
U. of Illinois, Urbana	50,332,000	18	68,562,000	19
U. of Colorado	44,460,000	22	66,134,000	20
Ohio State U.	37,034,000	30	64,952,000	21
Washington U.	52,512,000	16	63,340,000	22
U. of Chicago	50,592,000	17	62,706,000	23
U. of Southern Cal.	48,196,000	21	62,208,000	24
U. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	41,850,000	25	61,373,000	25
New York U.	39,494,000	29	60,491,000	26
Michigan State U.	28,777,000	41	59,168,000	27
U. of Pittsburgh	33,181,000	35	57,260,000	28
Gallaudet College (d)	148,000	371	57,135,000	29
Duke U.	42,531,000	23	54,047,000	30
Purdue U.	36,487,000	31	53,083,000	31
U. of Rochester	40,992,000	26	52,182,000	32
U. of Cal., Davis	42,111,000	24	50,109,000	33
U. of Texas, Austin	40,223,000	28	49,502,000	34
Yeshiva U.	40,252,000	27	48,423,000	35
Indiana U.	26,334,000	47	48,333,000	36
U. of Arizona	33,283,000	34	48,059,000	37
U. of Iowa	34,598,000	32	47,232,000	38
U. of Miami	27,986,000	42	46,381,000	39
U. of Utah	31,626,000	36	42,874,000	40
U. of Florida	25,134,000	49	42,642,000	41
Northwestern U.	31,722,000	38	41,636,000	42
Case Western Reserve U.	31,399,000	39	40,620,000	43
Texas A&M U.	26,924,000	44	40,023,000	44
U. of Ala., Birmingham	26,835,000	45	39,528,000	45
Boston U.	24,909,000	50	38,544,000	46
California Inst. of Tech	34,493,000	33	38,358,000	47
Oregon State U.	29,577,000	40	37,829,000	48
U. of Cincinnati	19,422,000	64	37,230,000	49
U. of Maryland, College Park	26,367,000	46	36,482,000	50
U. of Tennessee, Knoxville	$ 20,572,000	61	$ 36,265,000	51
U. of Kentucky	13,933,000	84	35,481,000	52
Baylor C. of Medicine	31,784,000	37	35,071,000	53
Inter Amer. U. of Puerto Rico, San German	0	—	33,824,000	54
U. of Mass., Amherst	14,146,000	83	33,757,000	55
U. of Missouri, Columbia	16,380,000	75	33,157,000	56
Vanderbilt U.	25,928,000	48	33,099,000	57
Louisiana State U.	19,100,000	65	32,621,000	58
U. of Kansas	21,718,000	59	32,598,000	59
U. of Virginia	23,284,000	54	32,367,000	60
U. of New Mexico	17,862,000	71	32,158,000	61
Rutgers U.	16,130,000	76	32,115,000	62
U. of Hawaii, Manoa	23,677,000	52	31,935,000	63
U. of Connecticut	18,911,000	66	31,909,000	64
Temple U.	15,217,000	82	31,891,000	65
Colorado State U.	21,926,000	56	31,646,000	66
Georgia Inst. of Technology	27,833,000	43	31,229,000	67
N.C. St. U., Raleigh	16,059,000	77	29,280,000	68
U. of Texas Health Science Center, Dallas	22,172,000	55	28,685,000	69
Va. Poly. Inst. & St. U.	16,711,000	74	27,037,000	70
Princeton U.	21,423,000	60	26,795,000	71
U. of Georgia	16,885,000	73	26,712,000	72
Carnegie-Mellon U.	21,861,000	57	26,701,000	73
U. of Ill. Med. Ctr., Chicago	12,017,000	90	26,116,000	74
CUNY, Mount Sinai School of Medicine	21,799,000	58	25,880,000	75
Albany St. College	24,024,000	51	25,534,000	76
U. of Md. Baltimore Professional Schools	17,171,000	72	24,811,000	77
U. of Cal., Irvine	18,426,000	67	24,664,000	78
Virginia Commonwealth U.	15,575,000	79	24,616,000	79
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute	23,415,000	53	24,171,000	80
Georgetown U.	13,489,000	86	23,773,000	81
SUNY, Buffalo	18,265,000	68	22,788,000	82
SUNY, Stony Brook	18,240,000	69	22,695,000	83
Washington State U.	13,162,000	87	22,570,000	84
Emory U.	16,028,000	78	22,351,000	85
Wayne State U.	11,900,000	92	22,261,000	86
Iowa St. U. of Sci. & Tech.	9,913,000	98	21,963,000	87
George Washington U.	13,608,000	85	21,740,000	88
U. of Alaska, Fairbanks	17,908,000	70	21,687,000	89
Rockefeller U.	19,511,000	63	21,484,000	90
U. of Texas Cancer Center	20,345,000	62	21,393,000	91
Brown U.	15,334,000	80	21,102,000	92
U. of Vt. & St. Agric. C.	12,035,000	89	20,518,000	93
Syracuse U.	10,263,000	97	19,252,000	94
U. of Rhode Island	12,907,000	88	19,092,000	95
Auburn U.	6,315,000	131	18,793,000	96
New Mexico State U.	10,484,000	96	18,679,000	97
U. of Oregon	9,311,000	102	18,296,000	98
Tufts U.	9,812,000	100	18,227,000	99
Oklahoma State U.	8,469,000	113	18,211,000	100
U.S. total	**$8,319,815,000**		**$4,155,366,000**	

(a) Amounts shown represent total obligations from 14 federal agencies which accounted for over 95 per cent of all federal obligations to universities and colleges in the United States and for 99 per cent of all federal obligations to such institutions for research and development. These proportions may not apply to all individual institutions, some of which receive significant amounts of their financing from agencies not included in the survey, such as the Department of Justice, the Veterans Administration, and the Smithsonian Institution. Amounts shown represent awards to individual institutions. Awards to the administrative offices of university systems are excluded from institutional totals because final allocation of funds is unknown, but are included in "U.S. total."

(b) Data for Johns Hopkins U. include $162-million obligated to the Applied Physics Laboratory, considered a federally financed research-and-development center until fiscal 1978.

(c) Howard U. and Gallaudet C. receive substantial appropriations from Congress each year for general operating expenses; their relative rankings thus reflect the magnitude of their non-science programs.

(d) Data for Pennsylvania State University include $12-million obligated to the Applied Research Laboratory, which was considered a federally funded research and development center until fiscal 1978.

SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Rules for Loans *Continued from Preceding Page*

publican who chairs the panel's Subcommittee on Government Processes, was particularly critical of medical schools that had poor records of collecting repayments from their highly paid graduates.

Some representatives of health schools said the new proposals would be too stringent. A spokesman for the Association of American Medical Colleges said many medical schools would find the proposed standards difficult to meet. He said the association had suggested alternatives, one of which would allow schools to demonstrate that they were exercising "due diligence" in collecting loans and to reduce their delinquency rates gradually without being penalized.

He said colleges could improve their collection rates if the law authorizing the loans were changed to permit institutions to write off obviously bad debts, pursue delinquent borrowers more vigorously, and limit the ability of such borrowers to receive other forms of federal assistance.

Said Martha Liggett, a spokesman for the American Association of Dental Schools, "I don't think most of our schools have problems with a 90-day delinquency standard, but a 30-day standard would cause real problems."

Allowing for the normal lag between the date a bill is sent and the date it is paid, she said, "a borrower could be just a few days overdue and be considered in arrears under the new standard. If someone is delinquent for 90 days, a couple of payments have been missed and you know there is some real problem.

"We don't need criteria so strict that they don't make sense."

Also, she said, setting a goal for delinquent loans of only 5 per cent may not be realistic for schools that now have rates of 20 per cent or more. "Some may be able to reduce their rates substantially, but 5 per cent seems a very strict target when, to my knowledge, there has never before been a percentage set for what is considered an unacceptable delinquency rate."

The proposals, and other changes in the mathematical formula for calculating delinquency rates, would make it hard for almost all dental schools to meet the new standards, she said.

Bruce Baggett, a spokesman for the loan program, defended the proposals. He said the Treasury Department considers delinquent any loan more than 30 days in arrears. The 10-per-cent and 5-per-cent rates proposed for acceptable delinquency rates are in line with commercial banking practices, he said.

He added that a higher delinquency rate would be allowed for nursing loans "because they are smaller than loans under the health-professions program, and so there is not as much money out per borrower."

Ellen Tewksbury, another official of the loan program, said that giving schools more than a year's advance notice of the changes should allow many to reduce their delinquency rates substantially. But, she said, officials are looking at ways to give schools that do not meet the goals extra time to comply without having to turn over repayments to the Treasury.

—CHERYL M. FIELDS